

ANNOUNCER: Our final panel presentation today features leaders of cooperative conservation from the Federal family. Please welcome our distinguished speakers: Representing the Department of the Interior Lynn Scarlett, from the Department of Agriculture Mark Rey, Conrad Lautenbacher Jr., representing the Department of Commerce, Alex Beehler from the Department of Defense, and representing the Environmental Protection Agency Marcus Peacock, and our moderator from the Council on Environmental Quality, Jim Connaughton.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: All right. Good morning everybody. I sat in on the prior panel and of course, I have very big shoes to fill as I've come to realize. I don't know if any of you know but Bill Ruckelshaus' shoe size is 14. And so it's actually impossible for me to fill his shoes. So I thought I'd go to the upper end of the body and try to match his hairdo.

Bill also did a great job at being Oprah. So I was trying to figure out what my model would be and I was going to go for Jerry Springer but they gave us these darn padded chairs. So I don't think we'll be able to pull that off either. But that said, we hope we can run up this conversation with this group's insights and then I'll have a few concluding remarks as we go forward.

Before we get into the panel, I just wanted to highlight for you because I received some questions. The Cabinet Secretaries that were here including the speaker today you heard intended to stay through the end of the conference because it was that important to them. But they have all been called back to Washington for a Cabinet meeting with the President this afternoon in response to Katrina.

Many of us also by the way have been a little bit distracted, and I hope you will forgive us for that because many of us have had to leave different meetings over the course of the last day yesterday because we all have our own individual roles in response to that. But we are working to balance that, and we appreciate your forbearance in that regard.

I would note Katrina is a terrible event and it's reeking havoc on a lot of people in America. As we leave the conference here today, I hope you all can find the place where you can do your part to help out. This is an episode of national consequence that requires the same spirit that we're bringing to conservation to go forward. We need that same spirit right here and now on behalf of the people in Louisiana and Mississippi.

Let's dive in. I'm going to start to set the expectation for this group since they won't be throwing chairs with a statement from the President. The President says, "Not all wisdom comes from Washington." Many of you have heard him say that. So the challenge for this group is I want to get as much of your wisdom out of them as the wisdom that they try to provide to you because the purpose of this conference is for us as much to share our experience as top down is for us to be able to reflect on what we've heard from you and the new thinking or ideas that we can use to shape as we go forward.

I also mentioned we had this great formal structure of the program. But how many of you can fully appreciate just how much was accomplished in the halls? That's going to be my first question for each of the panelist so they'll each get their 90 seconds or more because these are government geeks to just give me a reflection on what they heard in the hall. So it could be anything on any subject of any nature. But I just want to kick things off with what was heard in the hall and I'm going to start with Marcus.

MR. PEACOCK: Oh, you start with the new guy. I see. Actually I heard this in the hall yesterday from an NGO representative and I'll change the name to protect the innocent but you will know who you are. And they made a statement and I didn't catch the rest of the conversation but essentially it was "I think Joe and Susan are going to regret that they weren't here for this."

That reflects two things as a recent but former budget guy. I can appreciate Joe and Susan's skepticism regarding conferences because not all conferences are actually worth the time and effort to get there. But I think the skepticism was dispelled in the first conference. The breakout sessions were very down to earth, very practical and even at the plenary sessions very uplifting. It was a good combination.

But the second aspect of that which is important particularly since we're the last panel here is to make sure that Joe and Susan find out about what happened here when we all go home because they can benefit. You don't have to be here to benefit from it, although there's nothing like being here. So I think there's an obligation for us to go ahead and spread the things that we've learned here to those people weren't able to make it. So that's what I heard.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Thanks. Connie.

MR. LAUTENBACHER: I think what I gained out of

this as a general impression first of all which is very gratifying is the enthusiasm and interest with which people are talking about these issues that we've been dealing with for the last two days and from a wide variety of sources and different types of groups with different types of issues. But they are all coming together in this large convocation and that's an extraordinary event, building this voice together for harmony and looking at cooperative conservation as a way to work for the future is exciting to me and I'm delighted to see that kind of spirit here from every different group.

I think what people are really interested in now is what are the next steps? What are we going to do? What I hear is there's a lot of need for funding. There's a lot of need for management processes. There's a lot of need for ways in which we can provide productive connection to what we've gained from the conference and that's what I'm hearing from the people and I look forward to working those areas.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Lynn.

MS. SCARLETT: I'm going to draw on a little bit of poetry if I might, Jim, to answer that question.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Do you mean there were poets out there in the halls?

MS. SCARLETT: There may be some. But really this is a few words of poetry that draw on a collective sentiment that I heard and what came to mind where the words of poet Wallace Stevens who once wrote that "Perhaps real truth resides in a walk around the lake." I think that phrase captures a lot of what I heard, that by golly, successful conservation depends upon farmers, ranchers, the sportsmen community, the fishing community, the conservation organizations that are out on that land, know that land, live on that land, know it in summer and in winter and in spring and in fall.

I think also though the poetry reflects another reality and that is that our ongoing success with cooperative conservation really is going to depend upon building from the existing experiences we have in those endeavors. Let us not reinvent the wheel. Let us build upon the experiences that we have to-date from all of you here and all of your colleagues across America.

MR. REY: Brevity is sometimes not my strong point but I'll make an exception in this case because what I heard fairly consistently in the hallways is are you going to use the advice and the insights that we've provided you here this week and the short answer is yes.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Alex.

MR. BEEHLER: Since Jim mentioned a TV analogy, I'm going to follow up on another one. A major publication on the first day of the conference in its article mentioned DoD and conservation groups as "the Odd Couple" and someone came up to me in the hall and said, "Okay. You on behalf of DoD, which are you? Felix or Oscar?"

But what I am hoping is that the attendees here by today truly realize that DoD and conservation are not an odd couple but they really do go hand-in-hand and that belief is strongly shared and executed from the Secretary who of course spoke here and rather significantly because when was the last time a Secretary of Defense spoke publicly about conservation. But it goes from that level all the way down to the individual soldier and his civilian counterpart who are not only defending the land but they every day as part of learning how to defend the land are training and testing within the natural resources around.

As we heard today and perhaps for me the most moving were the comments by Mr. Burton on the place of the cove in his heart and how it developed an incredible lifelong passion. I believe that passion carries forth and will be accentuated throughout the military and certainly those of us in Washington would hope to convey that same passion in how we carry out and help the private sector with responsibilities of conservation.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Thanks. Well, that actually then brings up as we encounter Washington I call it the "you oughta" phenomenon. You know people come to us and say "You oughta do this." So one of the themes that came up is you oughta do more to empower, incentivize, inspire the federal work force toward engaging in these collaborations.

Now each of you has a different portfolio of how you actually manage your own work forces toward this. I just want to call out a couple of you. Lynn, you go first because the Department has put such a heavy emphasis on it. What have you been doing? But then I want to also to attach it to some of the ideas you've heard from the group as how you can carry that into a new place. So why don't we start with you, Lynn?

MS. SCARLETT: Thanks Jim. Over these last several years, we've realized that really a key to our being able to deliver cooperative conservation, to be good partners in lending a caring hand to landscapes with partners, is to ensure that our employees have the tools and the skill sets to do that and to be good partners. One

of the things we've learned, I talked with Marvin Moriarty from the Northeast Region of the Fish and Wildlife Service and he told me one day we wanted to hire a person for our partners from Fish and Wildlife Program and we wanted that person to be a partner type.

But the closest thing we could find in Federal job classification to announce the job was an editor. We reckoned that an editor might be able to write well and perhaps therefore communicate. So we announced for an editor and then we hired the poor fellow and said, "Guess what? You're not going to edit at all. You're going to go out and be a good partner and cooperator." Well, clearly that's a little bit of a roundabout way to go.

One of the things that we have done already is to first of all inventory all our training programs and try to insert into them tools for cooperation, mediation, facilitation, all those things that will help make our folks good partners in the field.

But going forward, I'm pleased to say that we've actually worked with all the Federal agencies on an idea for the future where we will be able to hire folks, promote them, reward them, for their great skills in collaboration, partnership and so forth. In fact, we're poised to sign an agreement to that effect and the Office of Personnel Management, this is getting D.C. wonkish stuff, but has really approved our ability to go forward and do that so that we won't any longer have to hire an editor when we want a partner. We can just go out and directly hire a partner.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Let me ask in turn Marcus and then Connie Lautenbacher because each of you has a suite of partnership programs in your agency. But it's my impression that there's no authorization for any of it. So could you reflect on how that's managed now but then how we might carry this forward so we are actually operating with a little more good old-fashioned oversight.

MR. PEACOCK: You're right. And there actually may be some benefits to that. One of the things we've heard echoed over and over again was the notion of having flexibility and adaptability in these processes and having informal networks that these can grow up by.

But it also means you're treading in possibly dangerous waters. Another thing that was mentioned over and over again is the fear factor that is there particularly in taking a risk to step out and try and solve a problem using partnership or collaborative approach. My own feeling is it would be probably be good to have some

sort of legislative framework to operate in which provides some balance between the ability to be some flexibility but also some structure to work in.

The other thing that happens though is in these informal networks is I think people are able to share information better than necessarily in a more structured framework and it doesn't get stove-piped as much. So I guess there's some tradeoffs there.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Connie.

MR. LAUTENBACHER: Yes. Thank you. This is an interesting question because NOAA as part of the Department of Commerce is well established but in fact is different from the other groups that are up here and I'm delighted to have this opportunity to make this paid political announcement that we have no bill which says there will be a NOAA. We have no "organic act." So there is nothing other than an executive order created by President Nixon that says there shall be a NOAA.

So our authorizing legislation comes in stacks that goes beyond the length of this table and set of chairs that we have here and it's individually a piece at a time. So our authorization that we deal with are very disparate and set up in a multitude of ways and as Mark has mentioned, maybe that's good in a way but I'm interested in having a more coherent way to look at the things that NOAA does.

Now in terms of the management, I'll just mention a couple of the programs that we have that are already set up collaboratively, partnerships. The National Sea Grant Program is a very important partnership that goes into conservation and education and research and is a grassroots level kind of partnership where it requires matching from the states and partners in the universities and local communities. It's a very good program in that way.

The National Estuary and Research Reserve group of the 26 of those that we have is a state-federal partnership that works very well and requires everyone to contribute to it. And there are a number of other programs within NOAA that are set up that way. So we have this, I won't say piecemeal, but certainly it's a program by program authorization and setup.

What we did several years ago when we do our management review and tried to revitalize the NOAA organization was set partnership as a governing principle of the way we operate because it is so inherent in many of the programs and I mentioned a few in the speech that I

gave for Secretary Gutierrez. So we are working in a sense the way Lynn is in terms of trying to make that a prerequisite for promotion, for pay, for motivation purposes across all of our programs. Let me stop with my filibuster for a second and let you go on.

MR. REY: If I could tag onto Connie's paid political announcement that the Forest Service does have statutory authority for partnerships but as part of the Administration's 2006 budget request we submitted legislation which is on Capitol Hill now to expand on those authorities and we're happy for anybody who wants to help us in securing that broader authority.

MR. LAUTENBACHER: I didn't mention. We also have, the Administration, the President has submitted a bill to provide an organic act for NOAA to provide a baseline that we can all work together. So I'm very proud of that fact that's been accomplished in the last couple of years.

MS. SCARLETT: Jim, you know I should just dive in a little bit because Secretary Norton in her speech did announce that we would be advancing cooperative conservation legislation and I know there's been both celebration of that and fear factor, what's going to be in that. Of course, partly this assembly will help us define what should be in there, but one key element that we expect to be in there is to authorize several of our very important cooperative conservation programs which like Marcus said we have been utilizing and have been having resources to provide grants with. But they have that uncertainty of not really having Congressional authorization. So our partners for fish and wildlife programs, our land owner incentive program, our private stewardship grant program, we're hoping might end up as part of that package.

MR. BEEHLER: And not to be left out, but from more a historic note, the Department of Defense does have a conservation buffer program to help communities work through the tripod issues of environment mission and sustainable development and that has now been an authorized program with Appropriations just for the first time in this passing fiscal year.

The point that I wanted to make though was the first endeavor seven years ago in a significant way at Fort Bragg, North Carolina was a classic example of people on the ground close to a situation. They knew that they had a problem and they talked to one another in a collaborative effort and it wasn't clear whether there was the statutory

authority to go out and fund third party purchase of conservation easement. But conversely, the lawyer said there's nothing that prohibits you to do it.

So once again, a classic example of both flexibility and certainty, certainty in that from the military standpoint we have a mission to do. How are we going to accomplish it? Flexibility is let's not get twisted around the axel as to whether we have all the statutory authority we need first to go do something. Let's be results oriented. Let's cooperate with all the groups we needed to and out of that developed a very successful program where all three components were truly winners.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: So it sounds like we need a just say yes program for the lawyers. Let me get into the weeds of this one a little bit because I heard frequently this refrain of where there's self-initiation was the roadblock of entry into these behemoth federal processes. So folks are trying to organize but how do they understand what exists for them?

There was another theme I heard. It was I-had-no-idea comment. I heard that all throughout the conference. I had no idea DoD was doing that. I had no idea that USDA had this program. So I would like you each to reflect on the access of folks. The internet is vast. How can they find their way into your activities especially the non-traditional constituencies? You deal with farmers but there are other people of interest now in farm programs. You deal with the federal land activities but there are other people. Let me start with Mark.

MR. REY: Particularly with the enactment of the 2002 Farm Bill and the expansion of Farm Bill conservation title programs, we have attracted a lot of new entries into working on our programs and a lot of new constituencies. We've dealt with that in part by expanding the amount of communications work we do at the grassroots level and in part by reaching out one-on-one to these constituencies. I'm not sure that there is a good programmatic solution to that. A lot of this goes word of mouth sometimes.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Let me ask it this way. Ward Burton was saying they have a lot of small land owners in their community. So even with \$40 billion flowing out to farmers and ranchers for conservation, in his community none of the farmers have a clue. So what's the diagnosis in that? What can we do? What can we take forward from here about these small land owners?

I also heard from a woman who, and I apologize for not remembering your name, is the leader is her small unincorporated town and therefore doesn't have access to some of our activities because it's an unincorporated township. So they don't have the legal positioning. How do we work our way to reach out to those constituencies?

MR. REY: I think the biggest challenge we're going to face in terms of dealing with small land owners, 20 acres and less, and there are going to be more of them over time rather than less of them because particularly the forest at this stage is being subdivided and divided over different generations is that a number of our programs particularly in the forestry area, less so in the farming and ranching area, are designed to incentivize good forestry, good farming and good ranching as they should be. But in many cases what we're going to find is the owner of five or ten acres of forest land is just interested in assistance to keeping that land and forest not necessarily in managing as a forest to stay.

One of the challenges that we'll have to look at in the 2007 Farm Bill is to figure out how to modify our programs or to develop new programs that reach that different constituency because it's going to be younger. It's going to be more urban oriented. And it's going to be a larger number of people who own a smaller amount of land with getting an aesthetic objective to holding the land.

MS. SCARLETT: Jim, let me offer a couple of thoughts. One, we can really help the smaller land owner by a little bit of one stop shop. The Department of Interior has a whole array of grants for cooperative conservation, many of them directed at small land owners and one of the things we originally found is that those were dispersed all over the place on 42 different websites and so forth. So we have now put a place on our Department of Interior website called "Cooperative Conservation." You can go there. You can find out what these grants are.

But beyond that, I think the most important way for knowledge to spread is indeed through the spontaneous communication that occurs as one person participates and then their neighbor. Let me tell a little story. I had the chance to go to Buffalo Creek in Western Pennsylvania and there we have our Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program at work with dairy farmers and beef cattle farmers or ranchers. I'm never sure whether they're ranchers in Pennsylvania.

But in any event, our Fish and Wildlife Service went knocking on the door. Can you imagine knocking on the

door to these farmers saying, "Wouldn't you like to participate in some streambank fencing and some native grass planting and putting up barn owl boxes?" Of course, initially they looked at them with wonder and barely opened the door a crack.

But as a few leaders stepped to the plate, they actually began participating and found that this was one of the most flexible, resilient programs that worked with them to do what they needed and wanted. Pretty soon, neighbors were knocking on the Fish and Wildlife Services door and saying "How do I take part? How do I get a barn owl box and a wood duck box and by golly, we even have bat boxes up there."

So I think that spontaneous ordering is really the most powerful way and I want to conclude with one of my favorite endings of this story. One of the farmers who began participating called up the Fish and Wildlife Service person a couple of months after he had been taking part and he was all excited and said, "Geez, Jose. I saw a yellow warbler." Jose turned to him and said, "Golly, Pete. How do you know? Last time I met you, you didn't know the difference between a turkey vulture and a wren?" And he said, "Because now I have my bird book. I'm in your program. I have my bird book."

That kind of enthusiasm is infectious and it does spread and they now have hundreds of miles that they're working with farmers, small farmers, in that Western Pennsylvania area through that word of mouth process.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Alex, let me ask you. Each of these folks represents the resource manager or the resource regulator. But you're similarly situated in your position to the land owner and to the big industrial interest if you will because the DoD is the world's largest industrial organization. So I want to ask you with that hat on and your top mission is not resource management. But I'd like you to take this set of comments but help us understand the resource management. How do you access a mindset and an organization that has a primary mission apart from conservation and what are the best ways of communicating? What opens doors versus what closes doors in terms of finding opportunities for partnership?

MR. BEEHLER: First, I'd like to say that for the land owners and the business folks as characterized we feel your pain. I mean we go through in our basis and in our industrial side of production the same issues that businesses and private owners go through under the intense

overlay of our national mission and that is best mirrored out in the over 500 major military installations which we have throughout the country and how best do we integrate into the community so that as Jim has said, we're able to carry our mission at the same time work and be wise steward of natural resources under our control and in which we use outside the fence line and that really is the key.

As you all know, we're going through this progress which at the end of the day will consolidate bases, will concentrate activities and therefore greater intensity of testing and training at proportionately fewer bases. What that means is that the military in order to carry out its mission at those bases will have to be drawing more and more on the shared natural resources not only inside the fence line but outside whether it's flight patterns, whether it's spectrum, whether it's the issue of we do for instance more and more night training because of our superior technology. If you have a lot of urban lights around the fence line, that is obviously direct competition.

And the other aspect which first sounds counterintuitive of all of the Federal land agencies, our basis are the greatest concentration of endangered species. We have over 320 endangered species and another over 500 imperiled or threatened species. The reason why we attract them is even though we're doing what we're doing from a mission standpoint those activities generally speaking are less disruptive than the surrounding ever increasing of urban development.

So how best do we balance these three things, carrying out our mission, taking care of our responsibilities to make sure that we have enough natural resources to carry out our mission and then on top of that our responsibilities to preserve and resuscitate endangered and threatened species while at the same time we are an economic engine for a lot of these communities?

Many of our bases for instance employ 20,000 to 25,000 people which therefore of course opens up other related jobs. At the same time, some of our most significant bases are the last sort of band of green between growing metropolitan areas. The classic example is Camp Pendleton between LA and San Diego.

That is why it is very important that local commanders and their environmental staff have gone out and reached out with the community early and often over a long period of time that transcend the variation of the two to three year rotation that often takes place in the military.

That's also why and we're in this regard very fortunate in the trend that state legislatures have led. There are now 18 states and a half of dozen more which have passed legislation that say to the local zoning boards when you're considering development around military bases within a certain radius you must engage the military in the process.

So we have that local and state legislative framework taking place to bring us into the community. We in turn recognize at our national level we have put out a directive which is the same thing as a regulation that says in writing that our responsibilities to protect the safety and well-being of people extends beyond the fence line to the surrounding local communities. That is a first that is very significant and that sends a clear signal from the leadership down to the individual soldier and civilian counterpart that that is top and part-and-parcel of the mission of execution.

We do have websites. My office has had a good outreach program to engage various parts of the nonprofit communities and in turn our military installations and you have the compendium and you have the case studies are doing every time a better and better job to engage the concerns of the local communities.

For us, we recognize that for instance dealing with the State of Florida, they have a very advanced set of programs. That's one relationship. The State of Texas, which I believe of all the western states, by far, has the least amount of Federal land and so would have a different dynamic. We've been working with them and then the State of California is another dynamic, and we have engaged in the flexibilities and these are states obviously where we have a significant military presence.

So it is the idea of creating trust which is really important from the military standpoint because we know the knee-jerk reaction is that we're potentially considered the odd couple. But to create the trust to overcome that, to engage the local communities, we even have advisory boards in our efforts of environmental clean-up so the local communities are involved every step of the way.

So it's a C change. It's a cultural outlook that transcends from the top to the bottom. Then it is trying to create transparency and the website is a wonderful thing as far as our various programs are concerned and of course, we're hopeful the program expands and grows on the conservation buffer zone and that will go a long way of helping to advertise opportunities for these

great stewardship efforts.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Okay. Let me shift gears a little bit here. I want to ask each of you one micro-level thing you're going to do as soon as you get back to your office as a result of the conference and one macro-level thing you personally are going to do. So to give you time to think about that question, I'm going to let you know what I'm going to do. I was really impressed with the presentation that I participated in by the Chicago Wilderness folks and I'm on Mayor Williams' Environmental Council in D.C. A number of elements of the way they constructed that partnership and then some of the planning components of that are exactly what the D.C. effort needs and does not have.

So on a micro-level as a result of this conference, I'm going to be sure to get those folks in touch with the D.C. effort because I think we have a lot to learn from them on behalf of the nation's capital and that will jump start and we don't have reinvent some wheels that they've already worked through. So that's a micro-level thing I'm going to do.

A macro-level thing I'm going to do is figure out conceptually and then structurally how we amplify after this a host of additional conversations just like this one whether it's sector relevant or region relevant to begin to get us, we are a disparate group, but to begin to sharpen the opportunities and the ability to access outcomes through this process. So just to give you a sense of what my mission is.

I'll go in random order. Connie.

MR. LAUTENBACHER: Okay. The first thing I want to do is check on the status of our website because we're doing the same thing that Interior has done. We have gone through and cataloged all of the programs which are cooperative conservation programs and can be reached individually and this is sort of an answer to a previous question and the fact is how do you get into our system and how do you know what's available and how do you deal with people.

Right now, you have to know the programs. You have to know how to get into the community-based restoration program. You have to know how to get into the port fields program that we're working on in restoration and the circle of program restoration. There are a number of programs. So we have done the same thing that Interior has and I'm going to make sure that our website looks just as good as Interior does. That's the micro-thing.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: But what you're saying is it's structured. You have to know the program in order to access the website. But if you don't know the program, you can't find your way to the website.

MR. LAUTENBACHER: Right. So we are putting a cooperative conservation header on the main page which is going to then detail the programs and my guess is that we haven't gotten them all yet because as far as I'm concerned, almost everything we do in this area is cooperative and can be put in this category.

Let me tell you. The macro thing that I think is extremely important is all of us have been engaged in the President's Ocean Action Plan and basically under your leadership and guidance, we have set up a revolution in ocean policy governance in this country based on the results of the OSHA Policy Commission. Now one of the basic tenants of that program is to have regional partnerships which are set up in order to help ensure that we are careful and prudent stewards of our resources in the ocean areas that are producing environmental, economic and social benefits and sustainable into the future.

We are beginning to set up these regional associations. We have one in the Southeast now which is very important. The governors have started working on it. We have a Federal cooperation advisory body that's working on a strategy. I just came back from a meeting of the New England governors and the Eastern Canadian premiers were setting up one in New England and we have now the Canadians to agree to an international ocean action kind of council for ecosystem management, restoration, habitat, conservation, those types of issues.

So bringing that kind of an approach as a tenant to this I think is very important and I intend to make sure we're putting that in at the grassroots level on this effort.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Great. Mark.

MR. REY: I think the micro thing that I'm going to do not because it's small in nature but because only a small amount of work remains to be done is complete the memorandum of agreement with our other agencies here to add into our job descriptions and personnel evaluations some emphasis on cooperation. That's big in importance but there's only a small amount of work left for us to do.

The macro thing is that I'm going to ask the Forest Service and the NRCS staff and they can work with other agencies and I'll invite each and every one of you to reflect further on the tension that we heard about

consistently over the last three days between regulation and collaboration, between the need for flexibility and the desire for predictability. I'll offer you one thing that I heard that seemed to make a lot of sense to me and you can reflect on whether this is a right rabbit trail to pursue any further and that is that over the last 30 years we've been involved in programs for environmental protection through classical regulatory mechanisms. And we know pretty well how to permit a new facility or how to do the regulations necessary associated with limiting actions so that threatened or endangered species aren't jeopardized.

What we're involved in more and more frequently today is environmental restoration and it may be that that same mechanisms that help us permit a facility or list a species are not the same mechanisms that help us recover a species or reclaim an abandoned mine sight or reclaim a wetland. And it may be that some of the tension that we're seeing can be sorted out by better defining the objectives of some of the efforts that we have underway and distinguishing them from what we were about 10 or 15 years ago not that those are less important, not that there's not a continuing need to know how to use and keep regulations that properly permit a new facility. But we may need to know how to do more things or different things as we embark on a broader set of programs of environmental restoration.

So that's something I'm going to ask our folks to work on further and I'll invite all of you to give some additional suggestions on as well.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Marcus.

MR. PEACOCK: I have two things. I don't know if they're micro or macro. We'll call them miacro.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Okay. Miacro.

MR. PEACOCK: One, the administrator announces the Good Samaritan Initiative and actually I think there are two confusing aspects I need to clarify about that. The first is Chapter 10 of the Book of Luke aside, the Good Samaritan Initiative is not a faith-based initiative to clarify that.

But the second is it is an initiative not a project. So while the first initiative is to clean up an abandoned mine site on the North Fork American Creek that is merely a first step and as Mao said, "The first cleanup of a half a million cleanups starts with that first cleanup."

MR. CONNAUGHTON: I didn't know the chairman had that much foresight.

MR. PEACOCK: Right.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: I actually probably stuck with the five year plan.

MR. PEACOCK: I got the Bible and the Little Red Book in the same answer, Jim. I did it. But the notion is this is an initiative. This is something that's going to keep going on and on. It starts with the first one but once I think you do the first one, the others get easier. The first will be an administrative agreement probably but we need to look at different tools for each of these cleanups and that team that's working on that initiative will benefit greatly from for instance what's been discussed at this conference. I want to make sure that team not only learns from this conference but learns from other people at EPA and other people at other departments that are wrestling with the same issues that have been discussed here. So that's the first thing I'm going to do.

The second thing I'm going to do involves the workforce transformation that's been discussed and it's a difficult issue because I think right now if you look at the workforce at least at EPA, a collaborative solution, partnership approach is still an exception in the way people think. This is no comment on the Forest Product folks but if you tell a carpenter to build a house, the house is going to be built probably out of wood and that may be fine for some houses. But it's not right for all houses.

So I think in order to make sure that those competencies are at the agency, we're not only going to follow through on making sure when we recruit that we're looking at those competencies, but do an inventory of the existing workforce to see who at the agency already has those skills or may not have those skills and find ways to train those people that need to be trained and make sure we retain those people who in fact have that in their toolbox. So those are the two things.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Great. Alex.

MR. BEEHLER: The micro would be as I'm a firm believer that successful conservation comes from the personal passion as much as possible. I will give you my email address alex.beehler@osd.mil to welcome your comments and suggestions and ideas.

As I said, the military bases are all across the country. They are obviously getting high profile. So you know in your own localities where the significant bases are. Where you have ideas and see opportunities, please communicate to me and that way we can make sure that

connections are made with the appropriate folks in the given installations.

The macro is really to take advantage at all levels with my Federal agencies here in their legislative efforts, with creative approaches with the various states and then with nonprofits and private individuals to as best as possible to award and recognize individual efforts and to work successfully with the communities so that results are the driving force and we are creative with the processes to reach the desired results.

I had one opportunity that came up with regard to one of the major states that is a very exciting opportunity. It's never been done before. No process laid, but the result could be fantastic. So it would be my desire to explore things like that and that's why the macro comes back to the micro in the one-to-one setting forth these ideas. So don't be shy.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Great. Lynn.

MS. SCARLETT: I want to cheat and say three things. My micro thing is I'm going to go back and plant my tree. On the macro level, we did announce that we would be seeking to craft a legislative package on cooperative conservation. My macro endeavor will be to invite all of you and your colleagues to help inform that process. The loaf is not baked yet. We do need your insights. We do need your ideas in terms of what needs to be in that package, what needs to be in that package so that we can take the long legacy of cooperative conservation that this nation heralds and really make it as I think David Struhs said our fundamental way of doing business this 21st century not dispersed and select and fragmented initiatives but indeed a fundamental way of doing business across these lands. So my macro goal will be to elicit ideas from you so that that loaf that we bake actually does that trick of making this a 21st century way of doing business.

The other thing though I want to add in is like my colleagues a lot of what really matters in our ability to nourish cooperative conservation is to have some unglamorous, behind-the-scenes tools that enable our employees to be better partners. We find things like for example procurement rules which don't enable our agencies jointly to, for example, enter into a single contract with partners on perhaps a land planning endeavor because our procurement rules are different from Marcus's and different from Connie's and so forth. So we want to work together to fix some of those technical, unglamorous, behind-the-scenes details but that in the end, give our agencies an ability

to be good partners so that you don't constantly run into that but-we-can't-do-that kind of refrain.

I'll end with also my quote from the Little Red Book. I think Marcus got the wrong one. And that is "Let's let a thousand flowers bloom."

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Very good. I'm a little alarmed by how many people in the republican administration are quoting Mao Tse Tung. It's the new capitalism.

MR. REY: It is a Red Book.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: It's a Red Book. Very good. All right. The toss-up question, get out your buzzers. The toss-up question and the charge comes to us from David Struhs who got us started CEQ I might add. The toss-up question is how do we solve the conundrum of the virtual flexibility with the desire for predictability? That's what I expected.

MR. REY: I think we ought to explore further the paradigm between environmental protection and environmental restoration.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: There you go.

MR. REY: I think pursuing that will lead us into some areas where greater flexibility is not only more desirable but will result in more effective environmental restoration.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Okay. So in classical Washington fashion, let's change the subject and go after that one. Mark, take it away.

MR. REY: Take which away?

MR. CONNAUGHTON: I think actually as we got towards the end of the day yesterday people all came to this understanding. I think there's this collective "Oh, yeah." You have environmental restoration as this group of activities that used to be led by government. But now you have this massive amount of environmental restoration work that's going on without being led by government and then we still have the issues of cooperative conservation, the context of the regulatory and managed world.

I think there was a big ah-ha that began to percolate. Again, it wasn't explicitly put that way but I do want to develop this one further and some of the differences because, I call it chasing ghosts, some of the concern about cooperative conservation as an excuse for abandoning the regulation is a ghost chasing exercise if the bulk of our conversation was really about how we mobilized the non-regulatory side of environmental restoration. So that's a long way of getting back but I want you to take it on first because in your agency you're

evolving rapidly on that.

MR. REY: I think true. We are involved in a lot more environmental restoration kinds of activities than we were previously in both agencies, in both the Natural Resource Conservation Service and the Forest Service. I think what I heard yesterday and the day before was that some of the activities that we're involved in are activities where there is a known and mutually desired outcome of a substantive nature and the achievement of that outcome is being at least delayed if not confounded by the application of some of the tools that we use to develop systems for environmental protection, in other words, tools that were useful to achieve a somewhat different purpose, the purpose of making sure in the case of the Forest Service that commercial timber sales didn't disrupt the environment or the permitting of a new mine on forest service land as opposed to the activities necessary to reclaim an abandoned mine. That's what I want to look into a little bit further.

MR. BEEHLER: And I would like to extend that by saying if one looks at the paradigm of environmental improvement versus environmental protection I think you even carry the ball further because improvement means how are you making things better, whereas protection innately means how are you making sure things don't get worse. The two are not the same. Particularly in this day and age where we've had 30 years of making sure things don't get worse and we've done obviously a good job at that, we're clearly ready to go to the next level of saying how do we make things better, concentrate on results, let process not dictate results, let results dictate process and encourage people to be doers toward these very demonstratively measurable goals.

Fortunately, for the Department of Defense, we've had legislation in the endangered species area that allows us to look at things. Instead of species by species, it allows us integrated, natural resource management plans to look things holistically on an integrated basis and in fact, we are looking to see not only how we're protecting what we have but how we are expanding the numbers of endangered species and that has been a wonderful sea change where once again everyone wins.

We're improving the environment. We get more flexibility on how we go about this in an appropriate integration with what we're doing with our mission. We had some examples of that and I think that kind of thinking that went into the creation of this integrated management

plan which by the way every single plan has to be blessed and approved by the regulators. So we're not getting out from under. What we are doing is taking a much bigger, more proactive picture on how we basically improve our involvement and I would suggest that kind of philosophy be reflected in more and more of the programs and regulatory efforts across our government.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Let me go to the end on this one and then I'm going to do a wrap-up question for everybody. But, Marcus, on the other end, we have the biggest industrial organization in the world and we have the most intensive, protective, regulatory agency in the world. Let's get your perspective.

MR. PEACOCK: I guess I would follow up on something Bill Ruckelshaus said earlier today and for me, I guess my focus would be on having those national standards or performance measures out there which would dictate continued improvement and focusing on the how of getting there through a more flexible process which is more in tune to what local people who actually live in those areas think makes the most sense realizing of course that some contaminants travel. But that the how is much more amenable to being dictated by a process which is not something that comes out of Washington but is something that goes through a lot more deliberation and is more adaptable once necessary.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Let me ask a concluding question of each of you because we got a good mix of what we learned and what we're providing wisdom on. We have over 1,000 people in this process. What do you in your specific role, you, because you're all in the operational, decision-making end of your agencies, you're the ones that drive these decisions, what do you need from this group because there's been a lot of what they need from us and now what do we need from them? So I would like your reflections on that in 30 seconds or less. Marcus.

MR. PEACOCK: To me, this is a fertile field. We've only started to get into at least from my perspective being in Washington and I go with the 1,000 flowers. I would like to have a lot more ideas about where this can be pursued and specific ideas about where this can be pursued even if that cuts across departments and agencies which I think many will. Because right now, I'm not sure if people in Washington are focusing on where those opportunities are but I bet everybody in this audience has a notion of where they may be.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Alex.

MR. BEEHLER: You know I would say that same thing. I always eluded to my request through email the specific ideas and opportunities and also concerns where you all think that things were done that were not that effective. I would also suggest and nobody at least at this panel and I don't think the first panel suggested also the power of the market where if that has been successfully tried at the local level, certainly encourage that because if a market works well, it works very efficiently and it extends its effect way beyond the potential of many Federal funded programs. So I would definitely encourage that.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Connie.

MR. LAUTENBACHER: Two things that I think are interesting that I would like to see that will help. First of all, this conference has started what I would hope to see as a stampede towards a national coherent, consistent message to come back to government. I sit all day and there's a whole cacophony of voices out there that want this little piece and that piece, this difference, that and it's difficult to deal with that. But if we can work together and have a coherent national voice on these issues we can all do so much better at improving our environment.

The second of all is that I would like you to realize that while we want this coherent national voice that we, I think and I've been working in government for 40 years in the Navy and now another four years in the Department of Commerce and this is the time when we have seen more meaningful interagency cooperation at the Federal level than I have ever seen in my time.

So we have a good setup here. We have the ability to have a national voice. We have the ability to have a coherent Federal Government and I'd love to capitalize on it. Thank you.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Mark.

MR. REY: I have a simple ask for all the non Federal partners out in the audience and then a very hard ask for a very small number of people in the audience. For the non Federal partners, I'd just like to hear from you when one of our Federal employees at the field level is doing a good job. Lord knows I hear enough about the opposite case.

Because our current generation of Federal employees are being asked to do something very different than what they were trained for and asking a dozen or so Federal agencies to do something different very quickly and in synchronous fashion is sort of like replacing the Rockettes at Radio City Music Hall with the elephants from

Safari Land three days before Christmas. So when somebody is doing well, it's often good to hear about it because then we can interact with them to find out what they did that pleased you.

The hard ask is for a very small number of people out in the audience. The Department of Agriculture brought about a dozen future leaders here with us this week. These are interns and work study students who are just beginning their careers with us. So if there are some of you in the audience please stand up for just a second so they'll know who you are. It's been said more than once at this conference that we're beginning the fourth chapter in American conservation and I think that's probably true.

Those of you who are here as future leaders have had the opportunity to spend three days with people who had a role in writing a good chunk of the third chapter as well as people who've provided a lot of raw material for the fourth chapter. But the fourth chapter will be yours to write not ours. So I would like you to keep these experiences with you as long as you can in your career because I would like you not to screw it up.

MR. CONNAUGHTON: Lynn.

MS. SCARLETT: I think the greatest gift that those assembled and your colleagues out across America can give is something you're already giving. Bill Ruckelshaus referred to this whole exercise as one of Jeffersonian democracy.

I would put it slightly differently. I think we have underway an institutional discovery process, a discovery process that will help us to answer the former question you asked about that tension between uniformity and its virtues and on the other hand the virtues of flexibility, resilience, adaptation and innovation.

We have an institutional discovery process underway where in the Northwest Straits we have new forms of governance between federal, state and local, between public and private, that in fact working out and playing out that interface between uniformity and flexibility, the need on the one hand for certain rules to ensure that water is clean, air is clean, but on the other hand, working out a context for decision making that allows for the insights of local folks on the ground, of land owners, of other interested folks.

So the greatest gift that you can give is one you're already giving which is that compendium of examples that we have and from which we can build. I think my greatest concern in this fourth chapter is that we'll get

so enthusiastic and entranced with it that we'll muck it up from Washington by trying to shoehorn it into a one-size-fits-all pattern. What we need is for these different experiments to flourish, to grow larger and to become that critical mass of the way of doing business and there will be a balance among certainty, uniformity, and flexibility. That's the gift I take from you. I will learn from that and continue to explore better ways that we can do business to fit into that process.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled panel was concluded.)